

Appl. No. 09/965,002
Amdt. dated 05/09/2005
Reply to Office Action of 02/10/2005

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the interview of May 09, 2005. In that interview, Applicants' attorney went over Claim 1 and its different elements and discussed Joyce et al. No agreement was reached.

Claims 1 - 36 are pending in the present Application. In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to the DRAWINGS, the SPECIFICATION and Claims 8, 9, 12, 20, 21, 24, 32, 33 and 36 due to some informalities. Claims 1 - 8, 13 - 20 and 25 - 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce et al. in view of Ahmed et al. (US Patent 6,647,432). Claims 9, 21 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce et al. in view of Ahmed et al. and Kimura et al. (US Patent 6,173,422). Claims 10 - 12, 22 - 24 and 34 - 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce et al. in view of Ahmed et al., Kimura et al. and Darland et al. (US Patent 5,101,425).

In response to the objections made to the DRAWINGS and the SPECIFICATION, Applicants have amended the SPECIFICATION to refer to reference numerals 332, 920 and 950. The SPECIFICATION has also been amended to change reference numeral "109" to reference numeral "108" and the first occurrence of reference numeral "1110" to reference numeral "1010" and to delete any reference to reference numeral "1025". Further, the serial numbers of all the related applications have also been provided. By this

AUS920010905US1

Page 17 of 22

Appl. No. 09/965,002
Amdt. dated 05/09/2005
Reply to Office Action of 02/10/2005

amendment, Applicants believe that no changes to the DRAWINGS are necessary.

Applicants have also amended independent Claims 1, 13 and 25 to better claim the invention. Further, Claims 8, 9, 12, 20, 21, 24, 32, 33 and 36 were amended to overcome the technical objections made thereto.

In addition new Claim 37 was added for consideration. Support for the first and second elements of Claim 37 can be found on page 11, lines 9 - 23 and page 13, lines 3 - 31. Support for the third element of Claim 37 can be found on page 14, lines 1 - 28. Support for the fourth element of the claim may be found on page 17, lines 9 - 13. Support for the fifth element of the claim may be found on page 17, line 15 to page 18, line 19 as well as Fig. 10. Thus no new matter has been added to the Specification.

For the reasons stated more fully below, Applicants submit that the claims in the Application are allowable over the applied references. Hence, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

As stated in the SPECIFICATION, in today's environment, a network may consist of different computer systems running under different operating systems and using different software management utilities. The network is generally managed by a system administrator who ensures that the network is operational and running at its optimum.

To perform this task, the system administrator periodically runs tests and executes management commands on the various systems in the network. When doing so, the system manager has to access each management software utility to issue a management command. Likewise, if the

AUS920010905US1

Appl. No. 09/965,002
Amdt. dated 05/09/2005
Reply to Office Action of 02/10/2005

system manager wants to monitor the status of the execution of the commands on the different computer systems, the system manager has to access each of the management software utilities. This can be a rather time-consuming endeavor. Hence, a need exists for a simplified mechanism to efficiently provide statuses of commands being executed on a plurality of computer systems. The present invention provides such a simplified mechanism.

In accordance with the teachings of the invention, when a command is being executed on a plurality of computer systems on a network, a dialog window may be displayed. In the dialog window, sub-windows for displaying present status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems may also be displayed. That way, the system manager may merely look at the dialog window to determine the execution status of the command on each one of the computer systems in the network.

The invention is set forth in claims of varying scopes of which Claim 1 is illustrative.

1. A method of **displaying an execution status of a command, said command being sent to a plurality of computer systems on a network for execution**, said method comprising the steps of:

displaying a dialog window, said dialog window being divided into sub-windows for displaying present status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems; and

displaying the status of the execution of the command on each of the computer systems within a proper sub-window. (Emphasis added.)

AUS920010905US1

Appl. No. 09/965,002
Amdt. dated 05/09/2005
Reply to Office Action of 02/10/2005

Applicants submit that the claims, as drafted, are allowable over the applied references.

Joyce et al. purport to teach a method of using monitoring tools to support the development of distributed systems that interact via message passing (see page 122, lines 1 - 3). In accordance with the teachings of Joyce et al., Jade, a programming environment, is used to support the development of a distributed program. Jade includes a window system, a graphics package, an interactive graphics editor and a distributed monitoring system (see Section 2 on page 125).

The graphics package provides routines for creating and manipulating pictures and the graphics editor facilitates the creation of pictures that can be used to represent specific states of an executing distributed program (see the 4th full paragraph of Section 2.1 on page 125). The window system may be used by a user to create and manipulate windows using a mouse, for example. A window is a virtual terminal as well as an interface to Jade processes (see the 3rd full paragraph of Section 2.1 on page 125).

Thus, in conjunction with the window system, the graphics package and the graphics editor, the distributed monitoring system may be used to observe a set of Jade processes executing on different machines (see the 1st full paragraph of Section 2.1 on page 125 as well as the 1st full paragraph of Section 2.2 on page 126).

The system may be set such that each time an event is received (which is generally done through message passing from one computer system to another), a picture that

AUS920010905US1

Appl. No. 09/965,002
Amdt. dated 05/09/2005
Reply to Office Action of 02/10/2005

represents a current state of the inter-process communication of the distributed application program is updated and displayed to the user (see Section 3.2 on pages 133 and 134). Consequently, an animated graphical view of an event stream, such as that shown in Fig. 7, may be displayed to a user.

Therefore, once a computer system on the network has arguably received a command, the computer system may start interacting with one or more of the other computer systems on the network and a resulting animated graphical view of that interaction may be displayed to the user. But note that the command would have been sent to only one computer system on that network and not to a plurality of the computer systems. Hence, Joyce et al. would have no reason to ***display a dialog window that is divided into sub-windows wherein the execution of the command on each of the computer systems is to be displayed.***

That is, even if the Examiner is correct in stating that Ahmed et al. teach using multiple windows for displaying information concerning operations of a networked system, (1) there would be no reason to combine the teachings of Joyce et al. with those of Ahmed et al. and (2) even if there were a reason to do so, the resulting combination would not teach the claimed invention since the command is only sent to one computer system rather than to a plurality of computer systems as claimed.

Since none of the other applied references (i.e., Kimura et al. and Darland et al.) teaches the emboldened-italicized limitations shown in the reproduced Claim 1 above, Applicants submit that Claim 1 and its dependent

AUS920010905US1

Appl. No. 09/965,002
Amdt. dated 05/09/2005
Reply to Office Action of 02/10/2005

claims should be allowable. The other independent claims, which all incorporate the emboldened-italicized limitations shown in the reproduced Claim 1 above, should be allowable as well. Hence, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are once more respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Abdelhadi et al.

By: 

Volel Emile
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,969
(512) 306-7969

AUS920010905US1

Page 22 of 22